

### Remarks

The Final Office Action dated December 11, 2009, lists the following rejections: claims 1-2, 9-12 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Plangger (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,727); claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '727 reference in view of Ito (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,629); and claims 4-8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '727 reference in view of Rodeschini (EP 1341150). Claim 18 is objected to but would be allowable if rewritten. In the following discussion, Applicant traverses all rejections, and does not acquiesce in any regard to averments in this Office Action (unless Applicant expressly indicates otherwise).

Applicant appreciates the indicated allowability of claim 18, if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant submits that there is not a *prima facie* case for the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The Advisory Action of February 24, 2010 presents what appears to be an illogical argument. The Advisory Action indicates that what is mirrored is the waveform between  $t_0$  and  $t_1$ . Since the claim requires that the mirrored waveform be for the following row selection time, then a previous row selection time would necessarily be between  $t-1$  and  $t_0$ . The '727 reference does not discuss the time period between  $t-1$  and  $t_0$ . Thus, there is no correspondence to the mirroring being based upon this time period.

Notwithstanding, Applicant has introduced facilitating amendments. These amendments include limitations directed toward assessment of the number of transitions saved and the number of transitions created. Applicant's specification provides support for these amendments and explains that it can be useful to consider the transitions created by mirroring as well as those saved (*see, e.g.*, paragraph 14, Applicant's specification, published version). Particular embodiments provide detailed algorithms for carrying out such assessments (*see, e.g.*, Equations 1 and 2, Applicant's specification). The '727 reference's brief mention of mirroring provides no such details and, in any event, does not teach or suggest an assessment both saved and created transitions. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejections are improper and requests that they be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections is improper and should be withdrawn and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, David Schaeffer, of NXP Corporation at (212) 876-6170 (or the undersigned).

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No.: 32,122  
Shane O. Sondreal  
Reg. No. 60,145  
651-686-6633  
(NXPS.632PA)